PROGRAM SPONSOR ALERT

Date: July 5, 2012 **Number:** 12-08

Subject: Biennial Reports: Pilot of Updated Section B and Additional Guidance for Institutions and Review Teams for Common Standard 2

Summary

Biennial Reports are a key component of the Commission's accreditation system and have been in place since the 2007-08 year. Section A of the Biennial Report requires institutions to provide program specific data for each Commission-approved educator preparation program. Section B is a summary of the institution's data and activities across the unit, including all Commission-approved programs.

This alert provides directions for the updated *Institutional Summary and Plan of Action.* The updated directions provide guidance to support each institution in documenting that the Unit's assessment and improvement system is in operation. In addition, this alert provides an expanded description of Common Standard 2.

Background

A review of the first few years of implementation of the biennial report indicates that, in general, institutions are using Section A effectively to demonstrate that each of its programs are collecting, analyzing and using candidate assessment and program effectiveness data at the program level. However, the review noted that additional guidance to assist institutions in completing Section B, the institutional summary and plan of action, would be beneficial. To address this, the COA has approved a pilot of an updated *Section B – Institutional Summary and Plan of Action.*

For those submitting a Biennial Report in 2012, the updated *Institutional Summary and Plan of Action* (Appendix A) is voluntary but highly encouraged. For those institutions submitting reports in August 2012 who are willing to pilot the new Section B, an addendum with this

---

information may be submitted any time prior to December 15, 2012. Beginning with the Fall 2013 Biennial Reports, the updated *Institutional Summary and Plan of Action* will be required.

Additional Guidance for Institutions and Review Teams Regarding Common Standard 2
Common Standard 2 requires all Commission-approved institutions to collect, analyze and utilize data at both the program and the unit level. It reads as follows:

> COMMON STANDARD 2: UNIT AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
>
> > The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes, and utilizes data on candidate and program completer performance and unit operations. Assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, and competence, as well as program effectiveness, and is used for improvement purposes.

Provided in Appendix B is additional guidance related to Common Standard 2 for use by institutions and accreditation review teams. This document was developed by staff and accreditation site visit team members after a number of years of reviewing different institutions' implementation of Common Standard 2. The Committee on Accreditation has reviewed the expanded description of the standard and approved it. This expanded description is being integrated into the Accreditation Handbook.

Page 1 of the expanded description of Common Standard 2 describes the steps an institution would need to complete to fully meet the standard. Each approved institution must be able to identify when and how each of the identified activities takes place.

The second page of the expanded description was developed to assist accreditation site visit team members to understand the complexities of the standard and to provide guidance as the team members come to a standard finding for Common Standard 2. Institutions sponsoring Commission-approved educator preparation may find this page helpful as well.

References
Biennial Reports Staff: BiennialReports@ctc.ca.gov

Biennial Reports web page: http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/program-accred-biennial-reports.html

Contact Information
The Professional Services Division provides a full list of topic-specific dedicated, email addresses as well as program areas with the most up-to-date Commission staff members' email addresses at: http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PSD-contact.html.

Biennial Report

SECTION B
(For Biennial Reports submitted in 2012, the Updated Section B is voluntary. If an institution elects not to complete the Updated Section B, please submit information for the original Section B which is noted below.)

<u>Original</u> INSTITUTIONAL SUMMARY AND PLAN OF ACTION
(Required for all program sponsors offering more than one credential or certificate program)
1-3 pages

This section reflects the institution's review of the reports from all programs within that institution. Given the information provided in Section A for each program, identify trends observed in the data across programs. Describe areas of strength, areas for improvement and the next steps or plan of action the unit will take to improve the quality of educator preparation. The summary is submitted by the unit leader: Dean, Director of Education, Superintendent, or Head of the Governing Board of the Program Sponsor.

<u>Updated</u> INSTITUTIONAL SUMMARY AND PLAN OF ACTION
(Required for all program sponsors starting in 2013)
1-3 pages

This section reflects the institution's review of the reports from all Commission-approved educator preparation programs within that institution. The summary is submitted by the unit leader: Dean, Director of Education, Superintendent, or Head of the Governing Board of the Program Sponsor.

1) If you have a one page graphic of your Unit assessment system, please provide it. If not, please **briefly outline** your system.

2) To support the documentation of your Unit assessment system in action, please provide a table that shows a sample of the actions the unit has taken in the past two years and link the action with the data and analysis that led to the action. If your institution only offers one approved educator preparation program, this information may have been provided in Section A. Do not repeat the information here, instead please refer the reader back to Section A. (Sample table provided on the next page.)

3) Please note any implications for your institution related to the Common Standards based on the data presented in this Biennial Report. This will require a review of the information presented in the Biennial Report with the concepts in the Commission's Common Standards (1-Leadership, 2-Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation, 3-Resources, 4-Faculty and Instructional Personnel, 5-Admission, 6-Advice and Assistance, 7-Field Experience, 8-District Employed Supervisors, and 9-Candidate Assessment). (Sample table provided on the next page.)

2) Documentation of Actions Taken in the Unit Assessment System
   Based on the Analysis of Data Collected (2010-11 and 2011-12)

Action Taken	Date	Data Source(s)	Analysis Leading to the Action

3) Common Standard Implications for 2012-13
   Based on the Analysis of Data Presented in the 2012 Biennial Report

Identified Issue	Program(s) Involved	Data Source(s)	Area of Strength or Area to Improve	Applicable Common Standard (s)

STANDARD 2: UNIT AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes, and utilizes data on candidate and program completer performance and unit operations. Assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, and competence, as well as program effectiveness, and is used for improvement purposes.

A Unit Assessment System is **a single integrated, comprehensive system** that takes into account the collection, analysis, and utilization of data, **by each program individually and by the unit across all programs**, for every credential program offered by an institution.

In developing a deeper understanding of the language in Common Standard 2, consider the following regarding collecting, analyzing, and utilizing data at both the program and Unit level.

	Collect **'Gather data'**	**Analyze** **'Organize data'**	**Utilize** **'Drive decision making'**
Unit	• Gather data across all of an institution's approved programs related to the Common Standards: 1) Leadership, 2) Assessment System, 3) Resources, 4) Faculty, 5) Admission, 6) Advice & Assistance, 7) Field Experience, 8) District-Employed Supervisors, and 9) Candidate Competence. • Collect data in an ongoing and comprehensive manner.	• Organize the data within the unit and across all of the approved program(s). • Discuss the data with faculty and others within the unit and all of the approved program(s). • Draw conclusions from the data to inform decision-making across the unit and all of the approved program(s).	• Use the analysis of the data for unit and program(s) improvement purposes. • Document the cycle of improvement decision-making for the unit and its programs. • Document actions taken, the basis of those actions and how/when the results will be reviewed next at the unit level.
Program	• Gather data related to the candidate competencies identified in the Program Standards • Gather data related to program effectiveness. • Collect from candidates, completers, employers, field supervisors and faculty in an ongoing and comprehensive manner.	• Organize the data within the program. • Discuss the data with faculty and others working with the program. • Draw conclusions from the data to inform decision-making within the program.	• Use the analysis of the data for program improvement purposes. • Document actions taken, the basis of those actions and how/when the results will be reviewed next at the program level.

At some institutions, each program has its own program evaluation and improvement process in place but the unit evaluation and improvement process has not been developed or has been developed but not yet implemented.

When Common Standard 2 was newly adopted, staff and members of the BIR talked about the standard as having two main parts—the program evaluation and improvement process and the unit evaluation and improvement process. If only one of the parts was in operation, usually the program evaluation and improvement system, then the standard was at least ***Met with Concerns***.

As the Common Standards have been implemented for a few years, it has become clear that program evaluation systems operating in isolation from one another **do not collectively provide evidence of a single unit assessment system**—regardless of how effectively they are operating. In this case, the fact that there are data being collected, analyzed, and utilized (CAU'ed) at the unit level (in isolation from program improvement efforts) is insufficient evidence of a unit assessment system under the standard.

The standard requires that the unit "*implement* an assessment and evaluation system," but teams are constantly agonizing over *how much* of the system needs to be fully operational in order for the standard to be met. Does "implements" mean that the institution has *initiated* the process of *collecting* data on program effectiveness and unit operations, or does it mean that the unit has *completed* the process of *collecting, analyzing, and utilizing data over a sufficiently long period of time to demonstrate that the process is "ongoing?"*

Guidance for Coming to a Standard Finding on Common Standard 2

Unit Assessment and Evaluation (unit operations—Common Standards)			Program Assessment and Evaluation (candidates and completers)			Common Standard 2 Finding
Collect	**Analyze**	**Utilize**	**Collect**	**Analyze**	**Utilize**	
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	**Met**[1]
Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	**Met with Concerns**[2]
Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	
Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	
No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	**Not Met**[3]
Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	
Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	
No	No	No	No	No	No	

This table provides examples but is not intended to be a complete listing of all possible combinations

[1] One comprehensive system is operating that takes into account the collection, analysis, and utilization of data, individually and across the unit and all programs offered by an institution.

[2] Most of these rows describe a unit that meets the program CAU criteria on a program-by-program basis, as well as performing CAU on some aspects of unit operations. The program data are used within, but not across programs; the unit data may be used to guide decisions at the unit level through processes separate from those used for program-by-program decision-making. In this case, a reviewer may find evidence of data-informed improvements at both the program and unit level, but they would be the result of "parallel processing" rather than an actual unit assessment system.

[3] These rows are variations on units that do not have a unit assessment system or that may have *designed* but have not *implemented* a unit assessment system. Many accreditation visits encounter "work in progress" with regard to unit assessment. If there is no integrated system that is in operation at some level, the standard is Not Met.